

1 [Submitting Counsel on Signature Page]
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: SOCIAL MEDIA ADOLESCENT
ADDICTION/PERSONAL INJURY
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

This Document Relates to:
ALL ACTIONS

MDL No. 3047

Case No. 4:22-03047-YGR

**AGENDA AND JOINT STATEMENT FOR
NOVEMBER 16, 2023, CASE
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

18 Pursuant to Case Management Order No. 1 (ECF 75), the Parties submit this agenda and
19 joint statement in advance of the November 16, 2023, case management conference.

20 **I. Additional Motions to Dismiss Briefing Schedule**

21 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

22 Plaintiffs have conferred with Defendants about a schedule for briefing any additional
23 motions to dismiss that Defendants anticipate filing with respect to Plaintiffs' Master Complaint
24 (Personal Injury), Plaintiffs' anticipated Master Complaint (Local Government), and the
25 complaint directly filed by 33 State Attorneys General in this MDL.

26 Plaintiffs propose the following schedule with respect to briefing on additional claims
27 from the Master Complaint (Personal Injury), such that oral argument could be heard by the Court
28 in late January 2024:

- 1 • **November 30:** Defendants file a motion to dismiss, not to exceed twenty pages, as to
2 Counts 5, 6, and 11-18 of the Master Complaint (Personal Injury). To the extent the Court
3 requests or requires additional briefing on Count 10 of the Master Complaint (Personal
4 Injury) concerning negligence per se, Defendants will submit a supplemental brief not to
5 exceed ten pages.
- 6 • **December 20:** Plaintiffs file their opposition to the motion to dismiss, respecting the same
7 page limitations as would apply to Defendants' briefing.
- 8 • **January 8:** Defendants file their reply in support of their motion to dismiss, not to exceed
9 fifteen pages combined.
- 10 • **Late January:** Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court hear oral argument on this
11 motion.

12 Plaintiffs propose the following schedule with respect to briefing on claims raised by
13 hundreds of school districts (and certain other local government entities), such that oral argument
14 could be heard by the Court in mid-May 2024:

- 15 • **December 18:** Plaintiffs file their Master Complaint (Local Government)
- 16 • **February 1:** Defendants file a motion to dismiss, not to exceed forty pages inclusive of all
17 tables and appendices, as to all counts presented in the Master Complaint (Local
18 Government).
- 19 • **March 18:** Plaintiffs file their opposition to the motion to dismiss, not to exceed forty
20 pages inclusive of all tables and appendices.
- 21 • **April 15:** Defendants file their reply in support of their motion to dismiss, not to exceed
22 twenty pages combined.
- 23 • 3 weeks after court's ruling on final motion to dismiss – Defendants answer

24 Plaintiffs observe that there is substantial overlap in the factual and legal issues presented
25 by the State Attorneys General in their complaint against Meta and Count 7 (Violation of Unfair
26 Trade Practices/Consumer Protection Laws), Count 8 (Fraudulent Concealment and
27 Misrepresentation against Meta), and Count 9 (Negligent Concealment and Misrepresentation
28 against Meta) of the Master Complaint (Personal Injury), and the causes of action asserted against
Mark Zuckerberg by certain Plaintiffs in their Short Form Complaints. Accordingly, Plaintiffs
propose that briefing of these issues be handled simultaneously. Plaintiffs support the briefing

1 schedule proposed by the State Attorneys' General presented in section II below.¹

2 Finally, to the extent the Court denies Defendants' motions to dismiss any cause of action
 3 set forth in either the Master Complaint (Personal Injury) or Master Complaint (Local
 4 Government), Plaintiffs request that Defendants be required to submit a statement of their
 5 affirmative defenses with respect to such causes of action within 2 weeks of the Court's order
 6 regarding the same. This will create efficiencies in discovery, as it will allow the parties to
 7 discover facts pertinent to both Plaintiffs' claims *and* Defendants' defenses, which would
 8 otherwise remain unknown until such as time as Defendants file their answer.

9 **Defendants' Position:**

10 ***Master Complaint (Personal Injury) MTD Briefing.*** Defendants propose that the
 11 deadlines for their motion(s) to dismiss Plaintiffs' non-priority claims commence after the Court's
 12 anticipated ruling on Defendants' motions to dismiss Plaintiffs' priority claims, as set forth
 13 below. Defendants also propose the same time-frames ordered by the Court in connection with
 14 Defendants' initial motion to dismiss Plaintiffs' priority claims in Case Management Order No. 3.
 15 Specifically:

- 16 • **December 5, 2023 (or 21 days after the Court's ruling, whichever is later)**: Parties
 17 shall confer regarding whether Plaintiffs will seek to amend the Master Complaint or
 18 withdraw any claims in light of the Court's motion-to-dismiss ruling. The parties shall
 19 also confer on proposed page limits for briefing.
- 20 • **February 8, 2024**: Defendants shall file their motion(s) to dismiss Plaintiffs' non-priority
 21 claims.
- 22 • **March 21, 2024**: Plaintiffs shall file their opposition(s) to the motion(s) to dismiss.
- 23 • **April 22, 2024**: Defendants shall file their reply brief(s).²

24 Plaintiffs' briefing proposal is unreasonable. They propose that Defendants file a motion
 25 to dismiss this month even though the Parties do not yet have the benefit of the Court's rulings on
 26 the pending motions to dismiss, which will be instructive to the Parties in briefing Plaintiffs' non-

27 ¹ Plaintiffs are reviewing former Facebook Director of Engineering Arturo Béjar's November 7, 2023, congressional
 28 testimony and related documents and may seek leave to amend the personal injury Master Complaint as to these
 Counts in light of the same and the documents referenced in the State Attorneys General's complaint.

² Defendants' proposed deadlines assume that the Court issues a ruling on the motions to dismiss as to the priority
 claims by December 15, 2023. Should the Court issue a decision later, Defendants respectfully request an
 opportunity to propose alternative deadlines.

1 priority claims. It will promote efficiency for the Parties to have time to review that ruling and
2 then confer on whether Plaintiffs intend to voluntarily dismiss any non-priority claims, after
3 which Defendants would promptly brief any remaining claims. For that reason, Defendants have
4 proposed a schedule that aligns with the original motion dismiss. Under Defendants' proposal,
5 the parties will have an opportunity to analyze this Court's order and then meet-and-confer,
6 including on whether Plaintiffs may seek leave to amend or to withdraw any claims in light of the
7 Court's ruling.

8 Plaintiffs' proposed page limits are similarly unreasonable, and Plaintiffs did not raise the
9 issue of page limits until the day before this statement was due to the Court. The Court gave
10 Defendants 100 pages for their initial motions to dismiss that addressed only five claims, and at
11 the October 27, 2023 motion to dismiss hearing, the Court stated that it would have benefited
12 from additional briefing on some aspects of these claims. Yet Plaintiffs now propose that
13 Defendants should brief most of the remaining claims in the Master Complaint in a total of 20
14 pages—or less than 2 pages per claim. Such a brief would not aid the Court in resolving the
15 claims. Moreover, until Defendants are informed by the Court's rulings on the pending motions
16 to dismiss, they cannot identify the aspects of the non-priority claims that will be the subject of
17 their motion, much less the appropriate page limitations. Rather than setting page limits now,
18 Defendants propose that the parties meet-and-confer on the issue after the parties have the benefit
19 of the Court's motion to dismiss ruling.

20 At this time (and subject to Defendants' request for a further meet-and-confer with
21 Plaintiffs) Defendants do not agree with Plaintiffs' position that the Court should defer briefing
22 on Count 7 (asserted against All Defendants), and Meta does not agree with Plaintiffs' position
23 that the Court should defer briefing on Counts 8 and 9 of the Master Complaint (or the causes of
24 action asserted against Mark Zuckerberg by certain Plaintiffs in their Short Form Complaints). In
25 particular, Defendants disagree that there is "substantial overlap" in the "legal issues" involved,
26 given the different standards that typically apply to certain aspects of claims asserted by private
27 parties and Attorneys General, respectively. Defendants submit that it would be more efficient
28 and expeditious to brief these counts at the same time as the other non-priority claims.

1 ***Master Complaint (Local Government) Motion to Dismiss Briefing.*** The Parties appear
 2 to agree that they should follow the same Master Complaint process as was followed with the
 3 personal injury cases. As with the personal injury cases, a Master Complaint will help guard
 4 against later disputes over the scope of any future rulings.

5 Specifically, Defendants propose to use the same basic procedures ordered by the Court in
 6 connection with the personal injury cases in Case Management Order No. 3, and have
 7 accommodated Plaintiffs' request to align briefing with the JCCP proceeding as follows:

- 8 • **December 18, 2023:** Plaintiffs are to file their master complaint(s). Plaintiffs shall also
 9 provide defendants with a proposed short form complaint and implementation order.
- 10 • **January 5, 2024:** After the Parties' continued meet and confer efforts, the Parties shall
 11 file a joint proposed short form complaint and implementation order, with any disputed
 12 issues clearly designated. The parties shall also file letter briefs not to exceed four (4)
 13 pages single spaced, 12-point font, with a single space between paragraphs noting the
 14 parties' respective positions on any disputed issues.
- 15 • **January 19, 2024:** Plaintiffs with complaints filed by the date the implementation order
 16 is issued shall file the short form complaint.
- 17 • **February 15, 2024:** Defendants shall file their motion(s) to dismiss on the master
 18 complaint(s).
- 19 • **March 28, 2024:** Plaintiffs shall file their opposition(s) to the motion(s) to dismiss.
- 20 • **April 26, 2024:** Defendants shall file their reply brief(s).

21 Plaintiffs' competing briefing schedule would require Defendants to file these motions to
 22 dismiss and reply briefs on the same day equivalent briefs are due in school district cases
 23 coordinated in the California JCCP, which would impose a significant burden on Defendants
 24 (who must coordinate the preparation, editing, and finalization of these briefs across multiple law
 25 firms and clients). Defendants' proposal would stagger the due date across these sets of briefs by
 26 only two weeks, and would not prejudice Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs again did not raise the issue of
 27 page limits until the day before this joint statement was due to the Court, and Defendants believe
 28 that the parties should have an opportunity to confer on that issue and submit a proposal (or
 competing proposals) on that issue. Until Defendants receive the Master Complaint and know
 what claims Plaintiffs assert precisely, Defendants cannot possibly know the number of pages that
 will be required to address that pleading.

1 Plaintiffs' answer deadline proposal is similarly premature (and only raised for the first
 2 time by Plaintiffs the day before this statement was due). Defendants propose meeting and
 3 conferring with Plaintiffs on the timing of any answer after the Court issues a ruling on
 4 Defendants' motion to dismiss in these cases.

5 ***Statement of Affirmative Defenses.*** Plaintiffs first suggested that Defendants should be
 6 required to file a "statement of affirmative defenses" two days before this statement was due to
 7 the Court, during the Parties' conferral regarding this Joint Statement. Defendants are continuing
 8 to consider Plaintiffs' proposal and will be prepared to discuss their views on it during the Case
 9 Management Conference. Setting aside the substance of Plaintiffs' novel proposal, Defendants
 10 do not agree that two weeks would be adequate time for them to analyze the Court's motion to
 11 dismiss ruling, research affirmative defenses on whatever remains of Plaintiffs' claims, and
 12 confer with their clients.

13 **II. Motion to Dismiss Briefing Schedule for State Attorneys General Complaint**

14 On October 24, 2023, 33 states (the "States") filed suit against Meta, asserting 54
 15 separate claims under state and federal law. That case was opened in the MDL on October 25,
 16 2023, and is currently stayed by operation of the Court's Order Setting Initial Conference (ECF
 17 2).

18 Meta and the States are continuing to confer regarding a briefing schedule on the States'
 19 case and will submit a proposal after the Court has appointed leadership for the States.

20 **III. School District Leadership**

21 On June 15, 2023, the Court ordered Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel to update the Court on
 22 the formation of a Government Entity Subcommittee at the next conference. *See* ECF 319
 23 (Amended Civil Minutes); *see also* ECF 310 (Notice of Government Entity Subcommittee); ECF
 24 311 (Proposed Order for Government Entity Subcommittee). Subject to Court approval,
 25 Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel propose Local Government Entity leadership that consists of two Co-
 26 Chairs working under the direction of Co-Lead Counsel: current Plaintiffs' Steering Committee
 27 Leadership ("PSC Leadership") member Michael M. Weinkowitz, and Thomas P. Cartmell, who
 28 has applied to be added to PSC Leadership with the support of Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel. *See*

1 ECF 413 (Mot. of Cartmell for Appointment to PSC Leadership). Both proposed Co-Chairs
 2 represent School District Plaintiffs in this litigation and have prior experience doing so, including
 3 trying such claims.

4 Mr. Cartmell's Motion has been noticed for December 12, 2023 in accordance with the
 5 Court's Standing Order. Plaintiffs will be prepared to discuss the matter at the November 16,
 6 2023, conference, and should a noticed hearing also be required, respectfully request that it be
 7 held as part of the scheduled December 13, 2023, status conference rather than on December 12,
 8 2023.

9 Defendants take no position as to the school district leadership structure.

10 **IV. State Attorneys General Leadership**

11 The multistate case is a coordinated enforcement action by thirty-three sovereign states.
 12 Through federal law and their respective state laws, each State has been expressly authorized to
 13 enforce the consumer protection laws raised in the complaint. The States have collaborated and
 14 operated jointly as a multistate coalition since the inception of their investigation into the Meta
 15 Defendants' conduct. The States agree that they wish to continue to do so throughout this
 16 litigation. For these reasons, the States seek to establish a leadership structure that is distinct
 17 from the existing Plaintiffs' leadership structure which governs the private and local government
 18 entity plaintiffs. The States are in the process of finalizing their structure and allocation of roles
 19 and anticipate providing the Court with a written update regarding the States' proposal before the
 20 November 16, 2023, Case Management Conference.

21 Plaintiffs and Defendants take no position as to the State Attorney General leadership
 22 structure.

23 **V. Pending Requests For Additional Production**

24 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

25 At least 43 State Attorneys General and the District of Columbia have sued Meta for
 26 youth addiction to Meta's social media platforms. These complaints have been filed in state and
 27 federal courts, including a consolidated complaint by 33 Attorneys General that was directly filed
 28 into this MDL. These complaints result from a bipartisan, nationwide investigation that began in

1 2021.³ As part of this investigation, it appears that Meta, and possibly other Defendants,
 2 produced documents and participated in depositions.

3 The Court previously ordered Defendants to produce materials previously produced in
 4 connection with state investigations, observing that “any burdens [to Defendants] are minor or *de*
 5 *minimis* at this juncture and are significantly outweighed by the efficiencies created.” *See* ECF
 6 125 (Discovery Order No. 1). The Court further noted that such productions would permit
 7 Plaintiffs to develop a “fulsome master complaint” which “will streamline these proceedings.” *Id.*

8 As discussed above, Plaintiffs are in the process of drafting a new Master Complaint
 9 addressing claims asserted by hundreds of school districts and hope to file such a Master
 10 Complaint on December 18, 2023. This Master Complaint should benefit from this new
 11 information, and the burdens to Defendants from their production are no more extensive than they
 12 were earlier this year. Accordingly, Plaintiffs request that Defendants update that production to
 13 include the following:

14 1. Unredacted versions of all complaints filed against any Defendant by any State
 15 Attorney General or the District of Columbia related to social media addiction;

16 2. Materials produced by Defendants as part of any investigation by any State
 17 Attorney General or the District of Columbia related to addiction to social media not previously
 18 produced in the MDL or JCCP; and

19 3. Transcripts from any testimony or statements, sworn to or otherwise, given by any
 20 Defendant, including their current or former employees or agents, as part of any investigation by
 21 any State Attorney General or the District of Columbia related to addiction to social media.

22 MDL Plaintiffs have coordinated with JCCP Plaintiffs on this request, and upon receipt of
 23 the requested materials, they will be uploaded into a document repository shared by MDL and
 24 JCCP Plaintiffs’ counsel.

25 **Defendants’ Position:**

26 Defendants have received Plaintiffs’ requests. Although the requests are premature in

27 28 ³ Press Release: Bipartisan coalition of attorneys general file lawsuits against Meta for harming youth mental health
 through its social media platforms, October 24, 2023, <https://coag.gov/press-releases/bipartisan-coalition-of-attorneys-general-file-lawsuits-against-meta-for-harming-youth-mental-health-through-its-social-media-platforms/>.

1 light of the discovery stay, in the spirit of cooperation, Defendants are actively meeting and
 2 conferring with Plaintiffs to determine if the Parties can reach agreement.

3 **VI. Plaintiffs' Request to Lift Discovery Stay**

4 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

5 Plaintiffs will seek a full lift of the discovery stay to affirmatively commence discovery in
 6 the MDL once the Court rules on Defendants' initial motions to dismiss, should any claims be
 7 permitted to proceed. Defendants have taken the position in meet and confers that discovery
 8 should only begin once all motions to dismiss are resolved, including as to the Master Complaint
 9 (Local Government) and the State Attorney Generals' complaint, and including any successive
 10 bids for immunity under Section 230 and the First Amendment that Defendants may wish to
 11 lodge. Should Defendants' proposed briefing schedule as outlined above be adopted, discovery
 12 would then not commence until May 2024 or later. This is contrary to the purpose of the initial
 13 motions to dismiss as contemplated by the Parties and the Court, which was to test Defendants'
 14 Section 230 and First Amendment immunity defenses, so that discovery could commence
 15 immediately in the event the Court denied the motions as to any of Plaintiffs' priority claims. *See*
 16 ECF 75 (Case Management Order No. 1) ("If any claims survive a motion to dismiss, discovery
 17 will immediately begin as to those claims."). Defendants' efforts to further delay discovery
 18 should be rejected.

19 **Defendants' Position:**

20 Plaintiffs' characterization of Defendants' position on the discovery stay is inaccurate.
 21 Defendants will be prepared to meet and confer with Plaintiffs about the timing and scope of any
 22 discovery following the Court's order on Defendants' motions to dismiss (assuming at least some
 23 of Plaintiffs' Priority Claims are allowed to proceed) and any amended master complaint and/or
 24 short form complaints Plaintiffs may be ordered to file. Defendants believe it would be
 25 premature and would not promote judicial efficiency to discuss discovery in the personal injury or
 26 other cases before that time, given that the Court's motion-to-dismiss ruling and any amended
 27 complaints will significantly inform the scope of discovery in these cases. Defendants will be
 28 prepared to discuss promptly following the Court's ruling the implications of that ruling on

1 whether and how discovery proceeds, reserving all rights in connection with any 1292(b) petition
 2 they may pursue.

3 **VII. Status of Plaintiff Fact Sheet for Personal Injury Actions**

4 The Parties in both the JCCP and the MDL⁴ have met and conferred for several months
 5 regarding a Plaintiff Fact Sheet (“PFS”) to be used in the personal injury actions, including a
 6 corresponding implementation order and retention of a vendor to maintain an electronic portal for
 7 PFS submission (MDL Centrality). On October 16, 2023, the Parties submitted a proposed PFS
 8 to Judge Kuhl in the JCCP (*see* Proposed PFS, Exh. A) and on November 6, they submitted the
 9 PFS implementation order (*see* Proposed PFS Implementation Order, Exh. B). On November 7,
 10 the JCCP ordered the parties to meet and confer within seven days on a few outstanding issues
 11 following a test of the PFS on a subset of Plaintiffs. The parties in the JCCP are to then alert the
 12 court of any outstanding disputes by November 14.

13 The Parties have also been negotiating a user account identification form and
 14 implementation order. The user account identification form used in the JCCP is identical to the
 15 Plaintiff User Account Preservation Form used in this proceeding. *See* ECF 269-1. The
 16 corresponding implementation order is related to accounts that Defendants have reason to believe
 17 are or were registered to the Plaintiff based on the Defendant’s reasonable investigation in this
 18 action (including the information provided by the Plaintiff in the Preservation Form), as well as
 19 account access in situations where the plaintiff is not able to do so following reasonable and
 20 good-faith efforts to regain access to the account (e.g., forgotten or unknown passwords and
 21 attempting to reset their password). Judge Kuhl ordered the Parties to submit simultaneous briefs
 22 on the one remaining dispute related to the user account identification implementation order,
 23 which will be heard at the JCCP’s next status conference on December 7, 2023.

24 The Parties anticipate continuing to work on the PFS and user account identification form
 25 and related implementation orders in the JCCP. Once complete, the Parties will confer regarding
 26 whether modifications to create an MDL PFS are appropriate in light of any rulings of this Court
 27

28 ⁴ Although these discussions took place under the auspices of the JCCP, MDL counsel participated and provided
 input anticipating that the same PFS would be used in both proceedings.

1 on the motions to dismiss. Subject to this Court's approval, the Parties will seek the entry of
 2 equivalent orders in the MDL.

3 **VIII. CSAM Preservation Order Entered in JCCP**

4 In the JCCP, the parties submitted extensive briefing and argument regarding an Order
 5 Governing Preservation of CSAM.⁵ Judge Kuhl entered a final order on July 31, 2023. *See* Exh.
 6 C. Plaintiffs request that the Order Governing Preservation of CSAM entered in the JCCP be
 7 adopted and entered in this proceeding. Defendants do not object to that request.

8 **IX. Matters Pending Before the Magistrate Judge**

9 ***ESI Protocol.*** On August 10, 2023, the Parties submitted a Joint Statement regarding
 10 outstanding disputes with respect to the ESI Protocol. *See* ECF 352. Included with this
 11 submission were copies of the Parties' proposed ESI Protocols, a redline comparison highlighting
 12 differences between the two proposals, and letter correspondence. *See* ECF 352-1-5.

13 ***Confidentiality Redesignation.*** The Court authorized limited discovery of Defendants'
 14 materials that had been previously produced in other proceedings, investigations, or hearings
 15 concerning the mental health of minors. *See* ECF 125 (Discovery Order No. 1). To expedite
 16 production, and because the Court had not yet entered a protective order in this case, Plaintiffs
 17 agreed to treat all of these documents as "highly confidential," subject to Defendants
 18 redesignating the documents as needed after a final protective order is entered. Judge Hixson
 19 then entered the Protective Order on May 25, 2023 (ECF 290), but Defendants have not
 20 redesignated their productions on the asserted ground that the Protective Order is not yet final.
 21 Plaintiffs moved for an order requiring the Meta Defendants and TikTok Defendants to revisit
 22 their designations. The Parties' respective positions concerning this dispute are set forth in a joint
 23 statement filed on September 20, 2023. *See* ECF 364.

24 ***Preservation Order.*** The Parties have engaged in months of lengthy negotiations over the
 25 various sections of the proposed Preservation Order. On October 17, 2023, Magistrate Judge
 26 Cisneros ordered that Defendants provide a list of every system or data source, including tools,
 27 that have potentially relevant information. *See* ECF 390. Defendants timely provided those lists.

28 ⁵ At the Court's request, Plaintiffs will provide courtesy copies of the CSAM briefing in the JCCP.

1 The Parties will submit a joint status report on December 6, 2023, in which they will either offer a
 2 joint proposal for briefing the remaining disputes or submit competing proposals with respect to
 3 briefing.

4 **X. Outstanding Coordination Order Dispute**

5 On May 10, 2023, the Parties submitted a Joint Statement re: Coordination Order and
 6 competing proposed orders for this Court's consideration. *See* ECF 267; ECF 267-1 (Pls. PO) &
 7 267-2 (Defs. PO); ECF 267-3 – 267-6 (Pls. Exhs. A-D); ECF 267-7 – 267-18 (Defs. Exhs. 1-12).
 8 The Parties have been coordinating between the MDL and JCCP and anticipate they will continue
 9 to do so.⁶ In addition to coordination with the JCCP, the Parties will likewise need to coordinate
 10 with the State Attorneys General. The Parties' disputes are ripe for resolution and the Parties will
 11 be prepared to address any questions regarding those disputes during the Case Management
 12 Conference.

13 **XI. Outstanding Protective Order Dispute**

14 On May 22, 2023, after briefing and argument, Judge Hixson entered a Protective Order
 15 governing confidential disclosures in this matter. *See* ECF 290 (Protective Order). On June 5,
 16 2023, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) and the Civil Local Rule 72-2, Plaintiffs filed a motion for
 17 relief from Section 7.6 of the Order. *See* ECF 303. Per the Court's Order on June 7, 2023 (ECF
 18 305), Defendants Meta, TikTok, and YouTube opposed Plaintiffs' request for relief (ECF 318),
 19 and Plaintiffs filed a reply in support of their request (ECF 321).

20 Because resolution of this motion has import for discovery upon it commencing, Plaintiffs
 21 request that if the Court desires argument on it, it be heard at the November 16, 2023, conference
 22 or at another upcoming hearing date. Defendants defer to the Court's preference to determine
 23 whether argument is necessary and set that argument for a date and time convenient to the Court.

24
 25
 26
 27 ⁶ On May 3, 2023, the JCCP Court issued a Minute Order outlining principles of cooperation expected from counsel,
 28 including: "(1) Discovery in the MDL proceeding and in this JCCP proceeding should be coordinated; (2) Discovery
 requests served and responded to in the MDL will be treated as though served and responded to in the JCCP; and (3)
 the JCCP court will not allow discovery in this case that duplicates what has taken place in the MDL." *In re: Social
 Media Cases*, JCCP No. 5255 (Cal. Sup. Ct.), May 3, 2023, Minute Order, at 2 (Exh. D).

1 DATED: November 8, 2023

2 Respectfully submitted,

3 /s/ Lexi J. Hazam
4 LEXI J. HAZAM
5 **LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &**
6 **BERNSTEIN, LLP**
7 275 BATTERY STREET, 29TH FLOOR
8 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3339
9 Telephone: 415-956-1000
10 lhazam@lchb.com

11 CHRISTOPHER A. SEEGER
12 CHRISTOPHER L. AYERS
13 **SEEGER WEISS, LLP**
14 55 CHALLENGER ROAD, 6TH FLOOR
15 RIDGEFIELD PARK, NJ 07660
16 Telephone: 973-639-9100
17 Facsimile: 973-679-8656
18 cseeger@seegerweiss.com
19 cayers@seegerweiss.com

20 PREVIN WARREN
21 **MOTLEY RICE LLC**
22 401 9th Street NW Suite 630
23 Washington DC 20004
24 T: 202-386-9610
25 pwarren@motleyrice.com

26 Co-Lead Counsel

27 JENNIE LEE ANDERSON
28 **ANDRUS ANDERSON, LLP**
155 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
Telephone: 415-986-1400
jennie@andrusanderson.com

29 Liaison Counsel

30 JOSEPH G. VANDZANDT
31 **BEASLEY ALLEN CROW METHVIN**
32 **PORTIS & MILES, P.C.**
33 234 COMMERCE STREET
34 MONTGOMERY, AL 36103
35 Telephone: 334-269-2343
36 joseph.vanzandt@beasleyallen.com

37 EMILY C. JEFFCOTT
38 **MORGAN & MORGAN**
39 220 W. GARDEN STREET, 9TH FLOOR
40 PENSACOLA, FL 32502
41 Telephone: 850-316-9100
42 ejeffcott@forthepeople.com

1 RON AUSTIN
2 **RON AUSTIN LAW**
3 400 Manhattan Blvd.
4 Harvey LA, 70058
Telephone: (504) 227-8100
raustin@ronaustinlaw.com

5 MATTHEW BERGMAN
6 GLENN DRAPER
7 **SOCIAL MEDIA VICTIMS LAW CENTER**
8 821 SECOND AVENUE, SUITE 2100
SEATTLE, WA 98104
Telephone: 206-741-4862
matt@socialmediavictims.org
glenn@socialmediavictims.org

9
10 JAMES J. BILSBORROW
11 **WEITZ & LUXENBERG, PC**
12 700 BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10003
Telephone: 212-558-5500
Facsimile: 212-344-5461
jbilsborrow@weitzlux.com

13
14 PAIGE BOLDT
15 **WATTS GUERRA LLP**
16 4 Dominion Drive, Bldg. 3, Suite 100
San Antonio, TX 78257
T: 210-448-0500
PBoldt@WattsGuerra.com

17 THOMAS P. CARTMELL
18 **WAGSTAFF & CARTMELL LLP**
19 4740 Grand Avenue, Suite 300
Kansas City, MO 64112
T: 816-701 1100
tcartmell@wcllp.com

20
21 JAYNE CONROY
22 **SIMMONS HANLY CONROY, LLC**
112 MADISON AVE, 7TH FLOOR
23 NEW YORK, NY 10016
Telephone: 917-882-5522
jconroy@simmonsfirm.com

24 CARRIE GOLDBERG
25 **C.A. GOLDBERG, PLLC**
16 Court St.
26 Brooklyn, NY 11241
T: (646) 666-8908
carrie@cagoldberglaw.com

27
28 KIRK GOZA
GOZA & HONNOLD, LLC

1 9500 Nall Avenue, Suite 400
2 Overland Park, KS 66207
3 T: 913-451-3433
kgoza@gohonlaw.com

4 SIN-TINY MARY LIU
5 **AYLSTOCK WITKIN KREIS &**
6 **OVERHOLTZ, PLLC**
7 17 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 200
PENSACOLA, FL 32502
Telephone: 510-698-9566
mliu@awkolaw.com

8 ANDRE MURA
9 **GIBBS LAW GROUP, LLP**
10 1111 BROADWAY, SUITE 2100
OAKLAND, CA 94607
Telephone: 510-350-9717
amm@classlawgroup.com

12 EMMIE PAULOS
13 **LEVIN PAPANTONIO RAFFERTY**
14 316 SOUTH BAYLEN STREET, SUITE 600
PENSACOLA, FL 32502
Telephone: 850-435-7107
epaulos@levinlaw.com

15 ROLAND TELLIS
16 DAVID FERNANDES
17 **BARON & BUDD, P.C.**
18 15910 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 1600
Encino, CA 91436
Telephone: (818) 839-2333
Facsimile: (818) 986-9698
rtellis@baronbudd.com
dfernandes@baronbudd.com

20 ALEXANDRA WALSH
21 **WALSH LAW**
22 1050 Connecticut Ave, NW, Suite 500
Washington D.C. 20036
T: 202-780-3014
awalsh@alexwalshlaw.com

24 MICHAEL M. WEINKOWITZ
25 **LEVIN SEDRAN & BERMAN, LLP**
26 510 WALNUT STREET
SUITE 500
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19106
Telephone: 215-592-1500
mweinkowitz@lfsbalw.com

28 DIANDRA "FU" DEBROSSE ZIMMERMANN

1 **DICELLO LEVITT**
2 505 20th St North
3 Suite 1500
4 Birmingham, Alabama 35203
5 Telephone: 205.855.5700
6 fu@dicellosevitt.com
7

8 **ROBERT H. KLONOFF**
9 **ROBERT KLONOFF, LLC**
10 2425 SW 76TH AVENUE
11 PORTLAND, OR 97225
12 Telephone: 503-702-0218
13 klonoff@usa.net
14

15 **HILLARY NAPPI**
16 **HACH & ROSE LLP**
17 112 Madison Avenue, 10th Floor
18 New York, New York 10016
19 Tel: 212.213.8311
20 hnappi@hrsclaw.com
21

22 **ANTHONY K. BRUSTER**
23 **BRUSTER PLLC**
24 680 N. Carroll Ave., Suite 110
25 Southlake, TX 76092
26 (817) 601-9564
27 akbruster@brusterllc.com
28

29 **FRANCOIS M. BLAUDEAU, MD JD FACHE**
30 **FCLM**
31 **SOUTHERN INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL**
32 **AND LEGAL AFFAIRS**
33 2762 B M Montgomery Street, Suite 101
34 Homewood, Alabama 35209
35 T: 205.564.2741
36 francois@southernmedlaw.com
37

38 **JAMES MARSH**
39 **MARSH LAW FIRM PLLC**
40 31 HUDSON YARDS, 11TH FLOOR
41 NEW YORK, NY 10001-2170
42 Telephone: 212-372-3030
43 jamesmarsh@marshlaw.com
44

45 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*
46

47 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
48

49 By: /s/ Ashley M. Simonsen
50 Phyllis A. Jones, *pro hac vice*
51 Paul W. Schmidt, *pro hac vice*
52 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
53

1 One CityCenter
2 850 Tenth Street, NW
3 Washington, DC 20001-4956
4 Telephone: + 1 (202) 662-6000
Facsimile: + 1 (202) 662-6291
Email: pajones@cov.com
Email: pschmidt@cov.com

5 Emily Johnson Henn (State Bar. No. 269482)
6 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
7 3000 El Camino Real
8 5 Palo Alto Square, 10th Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306
Telephone: + 1 (650) 632-4700
Facsimile: +1 (650) 632-4800
Email: ehenn@cov.com

9 Ashley M. Simonsen (State Bar. No. 275203)
10 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
11 1999 Avenue of the Stars
12 Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: + 1 (424) 332-4800
Facsimile: +1 (424) 332-4749
Email: asimonsen@cov.com

13 Isaac D. Chaput (State Bar. No. 326923)
14 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
15 Salesforce Tower
16 415 Mission Street, Suite 5400
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: + 1 (415) 591-6000
Facsimile: +1 (415) 591-6091
Email: ichaput@cov.com

18 Gregory L. Halperin, pro hac vice
19 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
620 Eighth Avenue
20 New York, NY 10018
Telephone: + 1 (212) 841-1000
Facsimile: +1 (212) 841-1010
Email: ghalperin@cov.com

22 *Attorneys for Defendants Meta Platforms, Inc.*
23 *f/k/a Facebook, Inc.; Facebook Holdings,*
24 *LLC; Facebook Operations, LLC; Facebook*
Payments, Inc.; Facebook Technologies, LLC;
Instagram, LLC; Siculus, Inc.; and Mark Elliot
25 *Zuckerberg*

1 FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
2

3 By: /s/ Andrea Roberts Pierson
4 Andrea Roberts Pierson, *pro hac vice*
5 Amy Fiterman, *pro hac vice*
6 FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
7 300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2500
8 Indianapolis, IN 46204
9 Telephone: +1 (317) 237-0300
10 Facsimile: +1 (317) 237-1000
11 Email: andrea.pierson@faegredrinker.com
12 Email: amy.fiterman @faegredrinker.com
13

14 Geoffrey Drake, *pro hac vice*
15 David Mattern, *pro hac vice*
16 KING & SPALDING LLP
17 1180 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 1600
18 Atlanta, GA 30309
19 Tel.: 404-572-4600
20 Email: gdrake@kslaw.com
21 Email: dmattern@kslaw.com
22

23 *Attorneys for Defendants TikTok Inc. and*
24 *ByteDance Inc.*
25

26 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSEN LLP
27

28 By: /s/ Jonathan H. Blavin
1 Jonathan H. Blavin, SBN 230269
2 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
3 560 Mission Street, 27th Floor
4 San Francisco, CA 94105-3089
5 Telephone: (415) 512-4000
6 Facsimile: (415) 512-4077
7 Email: jonathan.blavin@mto.com
8

9 Rose L. Ehler (SBN 29652)
10 Victoria A. Degtyareva (SBN 284199)
11 Laura M. Lopez, (SBN 313450)
12 Ariel T. Teshuva (SBN 324238)
13 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
14 350 South Grand Avenue, 50th Floor
15 Los Angeles, CA 90071-3426
16 Telephone: (213) 683-9100
17 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702
18 Email: rose.ehler@mto.com
19 Email: victoria.degtyareva@mto.com
20 Email: Ariel.Teshuva@mto.com
21

22 Lauren A. Bell (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
23 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
24 601 Massachusetts Ave., NW St.,
25 Suite 500 E
26
27

1 Washington, D.C. 20001-5369
2 Telephone: (202) 220-1100
3 Facsimile: (202) 220-2300
4 Email: lauren.bell@mto.com

5 *Attorneys for Defendant Snap Inc.*

6
7 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
8 Professional Corporation

9
10 By: /s/ Brian M. Willen
11 Brian M. Willen
12 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
13 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor
14 New York, New York 10019
15 Telephone: (212) 999-5800
16 Facsimile: (212) 999-5899
17 Email: bwillen@wsgr.com

18 Lauren Gallo White
19 Samantha A. Machock
20 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
21 One Market Plaza, Spear Tower, Suite 3300
22 San Francisco, CA 94105
23 Telephone: (415) 947-2000
24 Facsimile: (415) 947-2099
25 Email: lwhite@wsgr.com
26 Email: smachock@wsgr.com

27 Christopher Chiou
28 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
633 West Fifth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2048
Telephone: (323) 210-2900
Facsimile: (866) 974-7329
Email: cchiou@wsgr.com

29 *Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC,
30 Google LLC, and Alphabet Inc.*

ATTESTATION

I, Ashley M. Simonsen, hereby attest, pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil L.R. 5-1, that the concurrence to the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.

DATED: November 8, 2023

/s/ Ashley M. Simonsen

Ashley M. Simonsen